

## REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16.

### **I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-16**

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,590,928 B1 (“Haartsen”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

#### **A. Claims 1-10**

Haartsen does not describe each and every element as set forth in claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites “assigning a member address to a first slave unit, said member address corresponding to a selected time slot of a plurality of time slots . . . repeating in cycles” and “assigning to said first slave unit a first extended address associated with an occurrence of said selected time slot within at least a selected one of said cycles”. Haartsen does not describe at least these elements.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that these elements are anticipated because “when the slave is polled by the master, the master uses the master address to identify the group and the member address to identify the slave unit being polled”. Office Action at page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that the “master address” as used by the Examiner is not the “member address” as recited in claim 1 because, for example, there is no evidence that the “master address” in the cited text of Haartsen corresponds to any time slot and, in particular, a selected time slot of a plurality of time slots repeating in cycles. In fact, the Examiner has stated that the master address identifies the group of slaves in the piconet; accordingly, if the Examiner’s logic is followed, then all of the slaves must use the same time slot. Haartsen does not support such a contention. Instead, it is more likely that Haartsen supports serially polling all of the slaves (up to eight) of the piconet over a plurality of time slots in a single polling cycle. In addition, the Examiner states that the “member address” as used in Haartsen identifies the slave unit being polled. However, the “member address” as used in Haartsen does not describe an extended address and, in particular, an extended address associated with an occurrence of the selected time slot within at least a selected one of the cycles. Therefore, Haartsen does not describe each and every element as set forth in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Haartsen does not anticipate claim 1 and its dependent claims (i.e., claims 2-10). It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn with respect to claims 1-10.

**B. Claims 11-13**

Haartsen does not describe each and every element as set forth in claim 11. For example, claim 11 recites “means for assigning a member address to said first slave unit, said member address corresponding to a selected one of said sequence of time slots” and “means for assigning to said first slave unit a first extended address associated with an occurrence of said selected one of said sequence of time slots within one or more of said cycles”. Haartsen does not describe at least these elements.

In the Office Action, the Examiner again confuses the terms “master address” and “member address”. Applicants respectfully submit that the “master address” as used by the Examiner is not the “member address” as recited in claim 11 because, for example, there is no evidence that the “master address” in the cited text of Haartsen corresponds to any time slot and, in particular, a selected one of the sequence of time slots. Furthermore, the Examiner confuses the terms “member address” with “extended address”. The “member address” as used in Haartsen identifies the slave unit being polled. However, the “member address” as used in Haartsen does not describe an extended address associated with an occurrence of the selected one of the time sequence of time slots within one or more of the cycles. Therefore, Haartsen does not describe each and every element as set forth in claim 11.

For at least the above reasons, Haartsen does not anticipate claim 11 and its dependent claims (i.e., claims 12 and 13). It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn with respect to claims 11-13.

**C. Claims 14-16**

Haartsen does not describe each and every element as set forth in claim 14. For example, claim 14 recites “means for assigning a member address to said first slave unit, said member address corresponding to a selected one of said sequence of time slots” and “means for assigning to said first slave unit a first extended address associated with an occurrence of said selected one of said sequence of time slots within one or more of said cycles”. Haartsen does not describe at least these elements.

Since these elements are also recited in claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments made with respect to claim 11 be made with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Haartsen does not describe each and every element as set forth in claim 14. For at least the above reasons, Haartsen does not anticipate claim 14 and its dependent claims (i.e., claims 15 and 16). It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn with respect to claims 14-16.


## II. CONCLUSION

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance. Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Please charge any required fees not paid herewith or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: July 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael T. Cruz  
Reg. No. 44,636

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-2565  
Telephone: (312) 775-8084  
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100